DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 845 JC 010 276

AUTHOR	Fisher, Donald C.
TITLE	Austin Community College Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program Institutional Self-Assessment Report. Baldrige Assessment Feedback by Category.
INSTITUTION	Austin Community Coll., TX.
PUB DATE	2000-05-00
NOTE	110p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Outcomes Assessment; Community Colleges; *Institutional Evaluation; Leadership; *Quality Control; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Strategic Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Austin Community College TX

ABSTRACT

This self-assessment report is intended to serve as the foundation for Austin Community College (ACC) (Texas) to build a common language and to facilitate communication about performance excellence. Using the Baldrige Criteria in the areas of leadership, strategic planning, student and stakeholder focus, information and analysis, faculty and staff focus, educational and support process management, and institution performance results, campus interviews were conducted in the spring of 2000. Results include: (1) ACC's leadership system does not appear to be fully consistent; (2) the strategic planning process is not fully deployed throughout the college; (3) college-wide linkages between currently utilized mechanisms to evaluate offerings, facilities and services and their impact on student learning are not aligned; (4) ACC as a whole appears to lack a college-wide system and criteria for identifying institutions to benchmark against on comparative information; (5) there appears to be a lack of awareness of the college's strategic action plans and goals at all employee levels; (6) there is a need for the college to develop a systematic process to evaluate new programs before college-wide implementation; and (7) there is no systematic college-wide dissemination of student performance information. (EMH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 451 845

Austin Community College
Austin, Texas

Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program Institutional Self-Assessment Report

Baldrige Assessment Feedback By Category

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Melissa Oburn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Prepared By:

Dr. Donald C. Fisher
MSQPC-The Quality Center
Memphis, Tennessee

May 2000

JC010276

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The decision was made to conduct an assessment of Austin Community College (ACC) as a whole in January 2000. The Balridge Criteria for Performance Excellence is being used by Austin Community College in the early stages of our journey toward performance excellence. This self-assessment report will serve as the foundation for ACC to build a common language and to facilitate communic[illegible] about performance excellence.

The benefits of conducting the Baldrige Criteria Self-Assessment and developing action plans for improvement are:

- To jump start change initiatives
- To energize improvement initiatives
- To focus on common institutional goals
- To ensure that there is a clear connection between the key issues and the systematic approach embodied in the Criteria for improving the College's performance practices
- To ensure that senior leaders are aware of the key issues facing ACC
- To ensure that communication is directed to all employees

ACC's Self-Assessment process involved staff from a cross-section of functions and levels who participated on one of seven Baldrige Criteria teams. The seven teams consisted of 39 members representing administration, faculty, staff, the Foundation Board and students. Dr. Donald C. Fisher during a two-day Baldrige Self-Assessment Workshop administered training on Baldrige Criteria and techniques for conducting a self-assessment. Dr. Fisher serves as Executive Director of MSQPC – The Quality Center, Memphis, Tennessee. Dr. Fisher collaborated with Ms. Lelia L. Hackett in the analysis and compilation of the final report. Ms. Hackett is a Doctoral Administrative Intern from the University of Texas in the Department of Educational Administration of the Community College Leadership Program.

The following self-assessment results are based on campus interviews conducted during March 28 – April 6, 2000. The report findings constitute an analysis of data from 21 interview sessions as well as a review of supporting documents. Questions related to the Baldrige Criteria were used to gauge the College's performance against a national standard for institutional excellence.

Baldrige Assessment Feedback By Category

Reported Results By:

- Strengths
- Areas for Improvement
- Strategic Planning Issues
  - Short Term (1 – 2 years)
  - Long Term (2 years or more)

Baldrige Quality System Review Criteria
Category and Item Listing

1 Leadership

1.1 Leadership System
1.2 Public Responsibility and Citizenship

2 Strategic Planning

2.1 Strategy Development Process
2.2 Institution Strategy

3 Student and Stakeholder Focus

3.1 Knowledge of Student Needs and Expectations
3.2 Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction and Relationship Enhancement

4 Information and Analysis

4.1 Selection and Use of Information and Data
4.2 Selection and Use of Comparative Information and Data
4.3 Analysis and Review of Institution Performance

5 Faculty and Staff Focus

5.1 Work Systems
5.2 Faculty and Staff Education, Training, and Development
5.3 Faculty and Staff Well-being and Satisfaction

6 Educational and Support Process Management

6.1 Education Design and Delivery
6.2 Education Support Processes

7 Institution Performance Results

7.1 Student Performance Results
7.2 Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction Results
7.3 Faculty and Staff Results
7.4 Institution-Specific Results

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF KEY IMPROVEMENT FINDINGS

Executive Summary of Key Improvement Findings

Leadership

- ACC's leadership system does not appear to be fully consistent. It is inconsistent in the promotion of values and performance expectations that relate to the College's mission.
- A systematic approach in the College's chain of communication from senior leadership is not apparent.

Strategic Planning

- The strategic planning process is not fully deployed throughout the College.
- Effectiveness measures are not systematically addressed when focusing on student learning.

Student & Stakeholder Focus

- Collegewide linkages between currently utilized mechanisms to evaluate offerings, facilities and services and their impact on student learning are not aligned.
- An infrastructure to support newly implemented student programs and services does not appear to be in place.

Information & Analysis

- ACC's strategic action plan and data collection process is not consistent collegewide.
- ACC as a whole appears to lack a collegewide system and criteria for identifying institutions to benchmark against on comparative information.
- Faculty and staff need to be aware of the process by which senior leaders assess the College's progress in meeting strategic goals and plans.

Faculty & Staff Focus

- There appears to be a lack of awareness of the College's strategic action plans and goals at all employee levels.

- It appears that communication throughout the College is generally not effective.

- There is a lack of collaboration between faculty and senior administrators to ensure rapid response and flexibility in addressing student/stakeholder and operational requirements.

Educational & Support Process Management

- There is a need for the College to develop a systematic process to evaluate new programs before collegewide implementation.

- There is no established systematic process across disciplines to ensure that faculty is properly prepared to teach all educational programs and offerings.

- There is no systematic process of assessing the needs of students, faculty and other stakeholders in determining key educational support processes.

Institution Performance Results

- There is no systematic collegewide dissemination of student performance information.

- There is no collegewide systematic means of measuring and trending student/stakeholder satisfaction results.

Category 1
Leadership

1 Leadership

The ***Leadership*** Category examines the institution's leadership system and senior leaders' personal leadership. It examines how senior leaders and the leadership system address values, a focus on student learning, and performance excellence. Also examined is how the institution addresses its societal responsibilities and provides support to key communities.

1.1 Leadership System

1.1a(1) Institution's leadership system addresses values, performance expectations, student learning and goals

+ Strengths

- Board level policies focus on expected outcomes and strategic objectives for ACC.
- Board policies are posted and accessible to all faculty and staff to view.
- Board expectations and policies are clearly stated, in addition to clearly stated desired expectations for the College.
- Senior leadership have defined clear expectations for faculty /staff (e.g. job descriptions tied to performance standards, formal evaluation system, and development plan, and employee handbook).
- ACC's service leadership has established performance standards for student learning.
- Senior leadership has an established instructional delivery system and support services for students
- ACC's senior leadership promote student orientation courses, performance standards for student learning, various metrics, education plan support services, developmental goals, retention committee, retention counseling and point of service surveys.
- Senior leadership endorses Institutional Effectiveness activities that determine student completion/success (e.g. transfer rates, good performance).
- A comprehensive College Master Plan is in place that addresses student and stakeholder needs.
- ACC administrative leadership conducts surveys aimed at specific focus groups, i.e. Citizen's Focus Group, Retention Committee.
- Senior leadership support Advisory Committees that are in place to focus on various issues.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC's leadership system does not appear to be fully integrated and consistent. It is deficient in the promotion of values and performance expectations that relates to student learning.

- Several approaches support deploying student and stakeholder values, but it is not evident that they have been systematically installed throughout ACC.

- Job descriptions are not aligned with the new organizational structures and performance evaluations.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Alignment of job descriptions and performance evaluations throughout ACC
- Complete deployment of student career and transfer program

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Simplification of the student admissions and registration procedures

1.1a(2) Senior leaders set and communicate directions for the institution

+ Strengths

- Policies from the Board of Trustees are based on the Carver Model, which emphasizes outcomes or "ends".
- The Board engages faculty and staff in ACC's strategic planning process.
- The Strategic Planning Process led by senior leaders sets and communicates directions for ACC.
- ACC has administrative policies in place and available on the web for viewing.
- Annual institutional surveys are conducted on quality of services collegewide.
- Senior leaders set and communicate directions for the institution through clear administrative rules, institutional surveys and an evaluation system for all employees.
- ACC provides a safe climate conducive to learning that is promoted and monitored by senior leaders.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation (SACS) requirements are supported and adhered to by the College.
- Additional college newsletters have increased communication throughout the College.
- Senior leaders communicate through: ACC Bulletin Board, News & Notes, Professional Development Training, the Accolades Program, Teaching Excellence Awards, and various faculty/staff organizations.
- Senior leaders support professional development for both faculty and staff.
- The administration provides leadership in developing the Employee Recognition Program.
- The College has an improved faculty evaluation system.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC's senior leaders are not consistent in acknowledging and participating in informal employee events.

- Senior leaders need to communicate effectively about expectations, initiatives and improvements to be made.
- A systematic approach to communication from senior leadership is not apparent.
- Communication closure on issues and consensus building among faculty/staff by senior leadership needs improvement.
- Greater emphasis needs to be placed on supervisory communication skills.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Senior leaders need to simplify and clarify inter-campus communications
- Senior leaders need to be more involved in informal campus-wide events for faculty/staff

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior leadership should discuss, formulate and disseminate core values campus-wide
- Senior leadership should review their communication and consensus building skills

1.2 Public Responsibility and Citizenship

1.2a(1) Institution addresses regulatory, legal, and ethical requirements associated with institution operations

+ Strengths

- Board policies and administrative rules provide parameters for employees and the institution to operate.
- ACC's non-discrimination policies are reviewed periodically by the Board.
- ACC complies with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation requirements and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board guidelines.
- There is a systematic process in place for communicating regulatory and legal requirements.
- Administrative rules are published on the web.
- ACC provides an informative employee handbook that addresses regulatory, legal and ethical requirements associated with the College.
- The Human Resources department ensures that hiring procedures meet all regulatory, legal and ethical requirements.
- ACC has a high degree of compliance with various guidelines, specialized accreditation standards, applicable regulatory requirements and laws.
- ACC has a documented grievance procedure system in place to ensure that faculty/staff rights are fair and equitable.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- New hire orientation places emphasis on employee benefits, and lacks training/information on navigating information systems, campus ethics, ACC's Organization Charts, and reporting relationships.
- The Employee handbook appears not to have been revised in a timely manner.

- Classified employees appear to lack awareness of regulatory and legal requirements.

- ACC should improve the distribution of information to faculty/staff regarding ethic[illegible] standards, in addition to providing training.

- International students appear to lack clear information regarding rules and regulations of the College.

- During the hiring phase, little emphasis appears to be placed on regulatory, legal and ethical requirements.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Revise new employee orientation to augment information on ACC's regulatory, legal and ethical requirements

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior administrative officers should communicate ACC's regulatory, legal and ethical requirements each semester through various internal communication networks (e.g. faculty/staff meetings, e-mail, memos, etc.)

1.2a(2) Institution anticipates public concerns regarding its operations

+ Strengths

- Information is gathered from workforce advisory groups for use in meeting the workforce needs of employers and the community.
- Senior administrative leaders meet with senior management in public schools, business and industry to share information and receive feedback.
- ACC's Marketing and College Relations department is designated as the "sole source" of information for sharing College information with the public on a broad scale and to anticipate and prepare press releases.
- The President has strong links to the community and is able to set the "tone" for the College.
- Input regarding public concerns is received from various workforce advisory committees, the Capital Area Training Foundation, the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce, in addition to area industries.
- ACC has a large mailing list for sending newsletters to area businesses.
- There is significant participation and involvement by administrators and faculty who serve on advisory committees. The Chamber of Commerce and workforce boards trends are used to gauge public concerns regarding the College's operations.
- The President has linked himself and other faculty/staff with civic and community organizations. Established partnerships with community organizations have improved the College's public relations strategy.
- Senior administrators anticipate issues that may generate bad press, warn affected parties and prepare responses.
- The President serves on the boards of many community action groups and businesses and uses this involvement to gauge public concerns regarding ACC's operations.
- Board meetings and activities are continually used to seek community input regarding ACC's operations.

- Program advisory committees address labor market trends, workforce issues, tech/prep programs, school-to-career, Capital Area Tech Prep, Chamber of Commerce involvement and other issues.

- Publications from the Marketing and College Relations department promotes the successes of ACC. Publication is sent to the Chamber of Commerce and school districts.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- A system for communication with all employees about how to handle sensitive issues that have the potential to become "news" items is lacking.

- ACC appears not to capitalize on business partnerships for increased financial support.

- A systematic process is not in place to ensure that the college community is knowledgeable about ACC's ethical values.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Senior leadership should develop and document a systematic plan on how to handle college sensitive issues for employees to use

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior leadership should formally recognize and reward faculty/staff that promote and exemplify ethical values throughout ACC

1.2b Institution's senior leaders and faculty/staff support strengthening the community

+ Strengths

- Senior administrators serve on civic boards throughout the Austin area.
- Workshops focus on leadership development of students who return to strengthen their communities.
- The College collaborates with outside entities on business initiatives.
- ACC's Early College Start Program expands educational opportunities for public school students.
- ACC faculty and staff are involved within many areas of the community, serving on community boards and organizations (e.g. Greater Austin Initiatives, Arrow Round Rock Chamber of Commerce, Tech-Prep Consortium, Advising Youth Council, and Neighborhood Associations).
- ACC campuses are geographically located to offer services to all areas of the community.
- ACC has established key business and industry partnerships.
- ACC is involved with many charity and fundraising groups and events.
- ACC has class sites throughout its service area.
- ACC has established a Cultural Center at the Eastview Campus.
- ACC furnishes speakers through the Speaker's Bureau to help the community.
- The College supports partnerships with different businesses (e.g. Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology Engineering Program housed on the Riverside Campus).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- None identified

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Senior administration should formally recognize all faculty/staff who are involved in community initiatives on the Web site

Long Term (2 years or more)

- College to sponsor community open house annually on each campus

Category 2
Strategic Planning

2 Strategic Planning

The ***Strategic Planning*** Category examines how the institution sets strategic directions and how it develops key action plans to support the directions. Also examined are how the plans are deployed and how performance is tracked.

2.1 Strategy Development Process

2.1a(1) Institution considers student and stakeholder needs and expectations in its strategy development process

+ Strengths

- The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is involved in the College's strategic planning process.
- Initial strategic planning sessions included employee associations.
- The Master Plan involved faculty input and was an outgrowth of the strategic plan.
- Students have strategic planning input through the Board of Trustees.
- Task forces, advisory committees, and program reviews were used to develop the Academic Master Plan.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The strategic development process is not institutionalized.
- Faculty/staff at lower levels of the institution are not involved in strategic development.
- Internal communications both upward through the strategic development process and downward after the process is complete appear to lack deployment.
- The Master Plan does not address all areas and functions of the College.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Include strategic planning information in ACC's employee orientation for new hires

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Make the strategic development process less "top down," and more inclusive of all employee levels

- Formally account and recognize faculty usage and staff time used to support the strategic plan

2.1a(2) Institution considers key external factors in its strategy development process

+ Strengths

- Input from the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) has been utilized in ACC's strategic development process.
- The College has identified "best practices" and uses benchmarking results in its strategic plan.
- Accrediting agencies input has been utilized and considered in ACC's strategic development process.
- External surveys are conducted to determine community needs for the College's strategic planning process.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC's use of community partnerships for strategic considerations appears to be limited.
- The lag time between what is done in industry and the extent that ACC incorporates practices into its curriculum appears to need improvement.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Publicize advisory committee involvement and their role in workforce education in the strategic development process

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Develop a more systematic approach to promoting business contributions of ACC's strategic development process

2.1a(3) Institution considers key internal factors in its strategy development process

+ Strengths

- Faculty/staff groups have regular meetings with the President and input is used for the College's strategic development process.
- Several internal surveys have been conducted and the results used in the strategy development process.
- The College is attempting to relate facilities, operational and staff needs to the strategic plan.
- Several departments have conducted their own assessments and results are being used for consideration in the College's strategic development process.
- Academic units have begun student assessments and consider results in the strategic planning process.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has conducted surveys and helped to establish effectiveness measures.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Student learning appears not to be systematically addressed.
- Not all academic units have fully developed effectiveness measures.
- Staff is aware that data is gathered, but how it affects the planning process appears to be unclear throughout the institution.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Senior leadership to assess stakeholder involvement in ACC's strategic development process

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Share collegewide information taken from surveys and data produced for Coordinating Board reports with faculty/staff throughout the College

2.2 Institution Strategy

2.2a Institution deploys and tracks its strategy and action plans among faculty and staff

+ Strengths

- ACC has developed a master calendar for implementation of strategic planning.
- The use of electronic sources of information has helped deploy and track strategic action plans among faculty and staff.
- The one-college concept has improved communication within programs and the deployment of strategic action plans among faculty/staff.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Alignment between professional development, evaluation and strategic planning appears to need improvement.
- Internal communication to track ACC's strategic and action plans need improvement.
- ACC's follow-up on how the institution is doing in following and implementing the strategic plan need improvement.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Make better use of the Web site to deploy and track ACC's strategic implementation for faculty/staff

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Develop a formal communication plan that is user-friendly for faculty and staff to track ACC's strategic progress

2.2b Institution's projection of two-to five-year performance that will result from its action plans

+ Strengths

- Comparisons are made against statewide averages and Coordinating Board requirements.
- Enrollment and retention projections are used in scheduling.
- Benchmarks were developed through the Citizens Advisory Committee.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC's two-to five-year performance projections that result from action plans appear to need improvement.
- It is unclear to what extent faculty/staff are involved in making long-term projections for improved student achievement and operational performance within the institution.
- It is not evident to what extent ACC's two-to five-year performance projections are based on comparisons and benchmarks.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Form a faculty/staff cross-functional team that will be used to identify a minimum of five key performance issues and use these to project long-term performance against comparable institutions

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Continue to look at planning as a process that is long-term, rather than a one-time project

Category 3
Student and Stakeholder Focus

3 Student and Stakeholder Focus

The ***Student and Stakeholder Focus*** Category examines how the institution determines requirements, expectations and preferences of its students and stakeholders. Also examined is how the institution builds relationships with students and stakeholders and determines their satisfaction.

3.1 Knowledge of Student Needs and Expectations

3.1a(1) Institution determines current student needs and expectations

+ Strengths

- The newly implemented Datatel system has increased ACC's ability to capture data.
- Several departments are conducting surveys and holding focus groups to evaluate needs and expectations of current students.
- Students serve on various ACC committees and the Student Government Association (SGA) regularly reports to the Board of Trustees.
- Information regarding students' needs and expectations is secured to some extent from annual faculty evaluations.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC appears to lack support for the infrastructure to sustain newly implemented student programs and services.
- ACC's communication to the college community about collegewide assessments currently being conducted needs improvement.
- ACC does not consistently formalize surveys and other types of assessments that are currently conducted, including analyzing the data and making improvements based on the analysis.
- Assessments should be simplified in order to receive more input on needs and expectations of students.
- ACC should increase services for students with learning disabilities.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to formalize survey instruments and other types of assessment tools to ensure consistency in gauging results for student needs and expectations

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Student needs and expectations assessment instruments to be simplified in order to receive better qualitative student input

3.1a(2) Institution monitors student use of and satisfaction with offerings, facilities and services and the impact they have on active learning

+ Strengths

- ACC's Student Government Association reports concerns directly to the Board of Trustees.
- Specific disciplines and departments collect anecdotal information on utilization of services and others use feedback mechanisms such as student evaluations, focus groups and surveys to evaluate offerings, facilities and services.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The ACC Student Government Association appears to lack collegewide support to strengthen its organization.
- The link between the currently utilized mechanisms to evaluate offerings, facilities and services and their impact on learning are not aligned throughout the College.
- There appears to be no overall collegewide planning and consistency in monitoring feedback and evaluating the impact on active learning.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Better alignment of current mechanisms used to evaluate student offerings, facilities and services with direct impact on active student learning

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Continue to monitor feedback and evaluate its impact on active student learning

3.1a(3) Institution determines and anticipates the changing needs and expectations of future students

+ Strengths

- ACC's discipline-specific advisory committees participate in evaluating the needs and expectations of future students.
- ACC has an outreach program in place for community organizations, churches and various other civic groups to help gauge changing needs and expectations of future students.
- The ACC School and Community Outreach Office is devoted to creating linkages with area high schools.
- Research is conducted to identify national trends of future student needs and expectations.
- Workforce education programs utilize surveys of graduates and their employers to evaluate changing needs and expectations.
- ACC evaluates the transferability of coursework to area universities.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC does not consistently use measures/criteria to determine student expectations outside of anecdotal data.
- ACC does not employ hard data to gauge future student needs and expectations.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Use hard data to gauge student needs and expectations instead of relying on anecdotal data

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Develop measures/criteria to determine student expectations

3.2 Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction and Relationships Enhancement

3.2a(1) Institution creates relationships with key stakeholders

+ Strengths

- The College's administrative leadership creates effective relationships with business and industry.
- ACC's Student Government Association and employee associations make regular presentations to the Board of Trustees.
- The ACC Continuing Education Department plays a key role in creating relationships with business and industry by meeting the community's educational needs in the employment sector.
- ACC's shared governance model assures dialogue among faculty associations and employee associations.
- ACC has initiated dialogue and opened communication with area universities regarding transferability of coursework.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Senior administrators to develop better relationships with students, faculty and staff.
- ACC to create positive relationships with external organizations outside of business and industry.
- ACC to create a system in which there is consistency in developing effective relationships and capturing feedback on them.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC's senior administration to develop a leadership survey to gauge their relationship with key stakeholders

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Annually ACC's senior administration will identify key stakeholders to participate in focus group sessions to measure the use and effectiveness of relationships

3.2a(2) Institution maintains effective relationships with key stakeholders

+ Strengths

- Advisory committees are used extensively to address the effectiveness of community relationships.
- ACC has a single centralized point of contact responsible for providing services to the external community.
- Key ACC leaders have created effective relationships with business and industry.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC to focus on creating good relationships with internal stakeholders, especially students and faculty, to improve decision-making at the lowest level.
- A process to increase retention of students should be emphasized along with continued recruitment of new students.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC's senior administrators to host annual focus group meeting with key stakeholders to review program changes and proposed additions

Long Term (2 years or more)

- ACC to develop key measures to monitor the effectiveness and progress of key stakeholder relationships

3.2b(1) Institution uses processes, measurement scales and data to determine student satisfaction and dissatisfaction

+ Strengths

- Point-of–service evaluations and surveys are used to assess student satisfaction/dissatisfaction.
- Faculty evaluations by students measure student satisfaction/dissatisfaction with course offerings.
- Student course withdrawals and withdrawal rates are used as indicators of student satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC does not consistently use the information from student evaluations to create a better learning environment.
- It appears that ACC does not assess students' satisfaction before or at the time they drop a course.
- The ACC student compliant procedure is not deployed systematically throughout the College.
- There is a need for ACC to develop a system to measure both student satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
- ACC should stabilize its organizational structure, systems and training in order to accurately measure satisfaction and dissatisfaction among its students, faculty and staff.
- ACC should provide support to develop a "sense of community" among students.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Aggregate all student satisfaction data and use it to determine student satisfaction/dissatisfaction

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Conduct exit interviews with students at the time they drop a course. Use findings for improved student satisfaction in course offerings

3.2b(2) Institution uses processes, measurement scales, and data to determine key stakeholder satisfaction and dissatisfaction

+ Strengths

- Information derived from faculty evaluations and faculty focus groups are used to identify faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
- Periodic program reviews provide a mechanism to gauge user satisfaction.
- Feedback from other colleges (with whom ACC has articulation agreements) provides information about satisfaction/dissatisfactior with ACC programs.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC's use of processes, measurement scales and data are isolated and "homegrown." They need to be more uniform, formal and consistent.
- There are no clearly identified processes and measurement scales used to determine satisfaction or dissatisfaction of key stakeholders.
- There is a need for ACC to develop a mechanism to gather perceptions and views from business and industry, along with other external stakeholders.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to use third-party surveys, outside of colleges with which ACC has articulation agreements, to determine stakeholder satisfaction

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Identify and develop processes and measurement scales to determine satisfaction and dissatisfaction of key stakeholders

Category 4 Information and Analysis

4 Information and Analysis

The ***Information and Analysis*** Category examines the selection, administration and effectiveness of use of information and data to support key institution processes and action plans, and the institution's performance administration system.

4.1 Selection and Use of Information and Data

4.1a(1) Institution selects, manages and uses information and data to support key institution processes and strategic action plans

+ Strengths

- ACC uses data to support the leadership decision-making process.
- ACC reports quarterly and annually to college accrediting agencies.
- Data is collected to record milestones and published as a Fact Book.
- Many ACC units have established internal processes for gathering, analyzing and managing information.
- ACC units take advantage of a variety of information and data from diverse sources.
- There has been improvement in the reliability and consistency of data.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the Datatel system, and the ACC Web site support institutional processes.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There is no clear and consistent institution-wide process for gathering, analyzing and managing information.
- Linkages between information and processes are not clearly defined.
- Results of surveys are not consistently communicated to these who could use the data (e.g., faculty, deans, etc.).
- There appears to be frequent duplication of work because people are not aware of what data is available or how to access available data outside their own units.
- ACC employees appear generally unaware of the data needs of leadership.
- ACC's strategic action plan and the data collection to support it appears not to be evident to the staff required to collect the data.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to establish institution-wide policies for data collection, management and analysis
- ACC to define and document key processes and develop flow diagrams
- ACC to establish institution-wide criteria for data selection
- ACC to improve communication of the reasons for and results of collecting data
- ACC to establish uniform avenues for data sharing across units
- ACC to promote greater understanding of the importance of accurate information at the point of entry
- Senior leadership should deploy key data and information on its uses for strategic planning

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Create a reliable, consistent, interactive web-based infrastructure for data collection, management and analysis
- Communicate how the results of data collection feed into strategic planning

4.1a(2) Institution's deployment of information and data to faculty/staff that supports key institutional processes

+ Strengths

- An electronic infrastructure is in place and used extensively (e.g., e-mail, and web).
- An administrative system is available and staff rely on it for information.
- The College Web site includes minutes and agendas of meetings (board meetings, college committees and task forces, etc.).
- ACC's President is visible (e.g., campus visits, newsletter, broadcast e-mails, etc.).
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness produces summary data in formats that appear to be easily understood (e.g., the Fact Book, preliminary reports, etc.).
- Some units routinely publish results of internal research.
- Task Forces and programs serve as conduits of information for faculty.
- The College has increased newsletters, email forums, and administrative visits to campuses.
- Institutional technology data appears timely and supports processes.
- Datatel problems and solutions are communicated via the Datatel Update from Student Services.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Faculty members are generally unaware of the value of the administrative system (Datatel, etc) as it pertains to their needs.
- There appears to be a widespread perception that information is not consistently and routinely deployed to faculty/staff.
- Skepticism exists among faculty/staff regarding the consistency of data in the administrative system and whether web-based reporting of data is reliable.

- ACC's mechanisms for data analysis distribution appear cumbersome. ACC's web structure is not intuitive; so much of the web-published data analysis appears to be difficult to find and interpret.

- Faculty and staff concede that considerable information is available on the web but there appears to be widespread sentiment among faculty/staff that putting information on the web is not sufficient for dissemination.

- Faculty/staff rely heavily on informal means of communication, which appears to be a factor in the inconsistency of information flow.

- There are no institutionally designated "key" data to serve as benchmarking tools; the available data appears subject to various interpretations.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Clarify/simplify the process of information distribution

- Establish institution-wide policies for the dissemination of data

- Users of data need to be informed of its availability and how to access it

- Communicate to faculty/staff the process whereby data is fed from the administrative system to web-based reports

- Establish a clearinghouse of "best practices" for data dissemination

- Focus on formal, as opposed to informal, information gathering and dissemination

- Broaden scope of data distribution, and communicate to faculty/staff the importance of utilizing the administrative system to access data

- When reports support key processes, the process should be identified within the report either on the web or in print

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Create a reliable, consistent, interactive web-based infrastructure for the dissemination of data

4.1a(3) Institution's information and data support key user requirements

+ Strengths

- Key information regarding institutional processes is available on the web (e.g., board policy, administrative rules, college catalog and course schedule).
- Student data is secured on the administrative system (password protection, levels of security, etc.).
- Faculty and staff note that data is more reliable and has a faster cycle-time than in the past, in part because of improved technology (web, Datatel, etc.).
- ACC's data support infrastructure appears flexible and adaptable to changing needs.
- Data utilized in reports appear easily retrieved and consolidated.
- IT staff appears knowledgeable of the administrative system when data is requested.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Although improvement has been noted on the availability of data, it still appears to be unreliable, which has contributed to credibility problems with staff.
- IT appears to need more staff/resources to support users' needs.
- Faculty members appear generally unaware of administrative system tools available to them.
- Faculty and staff concede that information and data support certain users, but there is a sense that data is often difficult to obtain and interpret. There is a perception that data is organized in a confusing or misleading manner, or is often unreliable.
- Data reporting appears to need refinement for better reliability and validity.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Conduct faculty focus groups with an administrative system agenda, in order to assess faculty use/understanding of the administrative system
- Survey faculty to determine information and data user requirements
- Address concerns regarding data availability and reliability in order to improve faculty/staff confidence in student data
- IT staff/resources needs to be addressed in the light of technology and technological requirements
- Establish institution-wide policies for data collection, management, analysis and dissemination of data
- Communication/data management module (Datatel) to be implemented to promote effective use of data among faculty/staff

Long Term (2 years or more)

- IT staff/resource needs to be evaluated and addressed on an on-going basis
- Create a reliable, consistent, interactive web-based infrastructure for the collection, management, analysis and dissemination of data
- Users of ACC's information management systems require on-going training

4.1a(4) Institution evaluates, improves and ensures that information and data effectiveness of use is current with changing needs

+ Strengths

- Requests for information are made to and processed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness regularly and in a timely manner.
- Information is increasingly posted to ACC's web, and large amounts of data regarding specific functions/units are available and in an understandable format on the web.
- Data processes change to better serve students and staff.
- Library books are stocked when requested through ACC's information and data network.
- Some individual units review data collection/application processes periodically.
- Data collection/application processes are flexible, so that the College is able to adapt quickly to changing circumstances.
- ACC has used technology effectively to enhance the institution (e.g., Open Campus, etc.).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The benefits of the administrative system appear not to have been adequately communicated to faculty.
- Key reports are missing and/or need to be requested and developed.
- Library books are not re-stocked in a timely manner.
- Processes are changed but the reasons for and data underlying these changes are not communicated.
- Non-functioning or expired committees frequently appear on the Web site as active.
- It appears that ACC has no collegewide systematic approach for reviewing data collection, analysis, management and dissemination.

- Data is frequently available only through request of Office of Institutional Effectiveness rather than routinely available.
- It appears data has impeded rather than enhanced processes and use of data (e.g., incomplete implementation, etc.).
- Employees often appear unaware of what has been posted on the web.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Establish a comprehensive assessment/continuous improvement system for evaluating the effectiveness of institution-wide processes of data collection, management and analysis
- Increase communication between faculty and staff regarding information and data effectiveness of use
- Key data and information reports to be identified and developed
- Communicate the reasons and benefits for changing information and data processes
- Evaluate the role of books being stocked in library as opposed to a virtual library
- Review ACC Web site for uniformity, navigability, etc.
- Establish an institution-wide process and criteria for reviewing data collection/application processes
- Make data collection and use routine, through better utilization of data and information on the web
- Disseminate more information on availability of data and how to use it effectively (in particular, improve process for notification of what is posted on the web)

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Embed assessment processes into the infrastructure for data collection, management, analysis and dissemination
- Develop a comprehensive system for report generation

4.2 Selection and Use of Comparative Information and Data

4.2a(1) Institution uses comparative information and data

+ Strengths

- The LRS uses comparative data to formulate the budget.
- Benchmarking is done for staffing decisions, referendums and payroll items discussed by the Board.
- Some comparative data is used for projecting student enrollment and in retention reports (e.g., semester-to-semester, dean-to-dean and institution-to-institution data).
- Office of Institutional Effectiveness has developed mechanisms for comparisons with other institutions.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC lacks a systematic process for collecting and disseminating comparative data.
- ACC's use of comparative data and information is not explicit or well understood.
- ACC's analysis of comparative data appears to be externally driven (outside agency, board directive, specific problems, etc.).
- There appears to a perception among faculty and staff that comparisons with other institutions are only done when politically expedient.
- Individual units frequently gather their own comparative data, which results in inconsistencies between like departments on different campuses, etc.
- Analysis of comparative data appears not to be done frequently enough to keep up with changing needs.
- Faculty and staff appear unaware of comparisons initiated to improve basic administrative processes.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- The use of comparative data should be consistent across time and within departments
- Establish benchmarks and identify comparable institutions for all ACC functions and processes
- Institutional comparisons should be used to assist in improvement of service delivery

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Create a comprehensive system to draw on comparative data from appropriate institutions to improve selected ACC functions and processes

4.2a(2) Institution uses criteria to select comparative information and data

+ Strengths

- ACC utilizes data from institutions that are consistent with ACC's size and culture (i.e. multi-campus, metropolitan colleges, number of students served, etc.).
- ACC periodically identifies benchmark institutions and comparative institutions.
- Comparative data is primarily used to address standards for THECB and SACS.
- The collection, analysis and evaluation of comparative data is done mainly by two offices and compiled for board review.
- ACC uses industry input to define and support decisions on program and course needs.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC appears to lack collegewide criteria for the selection of comparative information, and most of the criteria used are externally rather than internally imposed (e.g., SACS and other accrediting agencies).
- Faculty and staff appear unaware of the criteria used for selecting and gathering comparative data.
- Criteria for the selection of comparative data are not communicated to personnel collecting data.
- Criteria for the selection of comparative data are set with little input from or understanding by staff.
- There appears to be considerable apathy on the part of staff in the process of collecting data.
- There appears to no comparison data collected beyond those institutions of similar size and structure.

- There appears to be a widespread speculation among faculty/staff that most decisions are politically driven, rather than data driven.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Greater staff involvement in the data collection process
- Criteria for the selection and use of comparative data to be published with reports
- Establish clear criteria for the selection of comparative data

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Create a comprehensive system to draw on comparative data from appropriate institutions to improve overall ACC functions and processes

4.2a(3) Institution deploys comparative information and data to all potential users to set stretch targets

+ Strengths

- Contact with and requests from industry appear to be driving the decisions and targets in workforce programs and courses, particularly at the program level.
- Comparative data are sent to administration and used by staff to lobby for initiatives.
- Benchmarking by focus groups at national meetings formulates targets for administrative staff (Data Warehousing).
- Units use data for planning (e.g., to justify budget requests, scheduling, etc.).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There is a widespread speculation among faculty/staff that goals are set with little understanding of the process and information utilized to drive it. Faculty and staff speculate that data submitted is not routinely utilized in target setting.
- Faculty and staff note that there is little feedback during the budget process once proposals have been sent forward.
- There is a perception that comparative data and its significance is available "only at the highest levels," and that decisions about comparative data do not filter down.
- Several faculty/staff view comparative data as either irrelevant or unavailable, and ACC employees report that they receive few "prompts" about data availability.
- ACC has no routine schedule for deployment of data, and the data that is deployed is viewed by faculty/staff as inconsistent.
- Faculty members frequently report that there is little prospective inclusion of academic programs in overall strategic planning.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Establish routine and stable feedback mechanisms to inform faculty and staff of how goals were set, the reasons for setting them, and why certain targets/proposals were not considered
- Establish a reward system that includes collegewide recognition
- Broaden the base of comparative data sources
- Ensure availability and significance of comparative data
- Determine what users (e.g., programs, unit, etc.) require comparative data

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Create a comprehensive system to draw on comparative data from appropriate institutions to improve overall ACC functions and processes

4.2a(4) Institution evaluates and improves deployment and effectiveness of use of comparative information and data

+ Strengths

- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) surveys employees and outside institutions of comparable size.
- The OIE Web site is kept up to date.
- The Fact Book shows a campus-by-campus breakdown of information by dean, department and course.
- The Fact Book shows the demographics of the service area as compared to the College.
- ACC compares data with that from similar institutions to determine fees, costs, etc.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There appears to be no comprehensive mechanism in place to evaluate the deployment and effective use of comparative data.
- People are unaware of whether of how the College evaluates and improves the use of comparative data.
- ACC has no centralized collection/dissemination point for information.
- ACC does not consistently evaluate comparative data for relevance to ACC functions/operations.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Conduct a process evaluation of how comparative information is used, and apply the results to improve and unify the current processes

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Create a comprehensive system to draw on comparative data from appropriate institutions to improve overall ACC functions and processes

4.3 Analysis and Review of institution Performance

4.3a(1) Institution's student and student group performance data is integrated and analyzed to assess overall institution performance

+ Strengths

- Data analysis for the accreditation visit by SACS is done in a timely manner.
- OIE analyzes sections-based data to assess enrollment patterns (e.g., students turned away and/or dropped from sections).
- Cohort studies are done to track student success and completion information.
- ACC units conduct classroom surveys to determine students' course needs and preferences concerning time of section, structure of delivery, etc.
- OIE's unit level database process collects student and program data.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There appears to be confusion among faculty and staff regarding which measures of student performance is significant in assessing the overall performance of the institution.
- Analysis appears to be driven by requests from outside agencies, and therefore is not consistent across years.
- Faculty and staff report that ACC's program and course approval process is inefficient and does not allow for changing needs of the workforce.
- Faculty and staff are generally uninvolved in or unaware of processes used to collect and analyze student performance data, and they are unaware of the ways in which such data drives instructional programs or helps assess overall performance.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Identify and communicate to all employees the key factors for overall institutional performance

- The level of employee involvement and function in data collection should be assessed. Involve employees (especially faculty) in integration of data for overall institutional performance

- Promote greater understanding of the alignment between outside accreditation agencies and the College

- Share benchmark data on student success with units/programs throughout ACC

Long Term (2 years or more)

- SACS site visit findings to be made public and discussed in a forum

- Institute a systematic means of communicating overall institutional performance (e.g., "State of the College reports")

- Lobby THECB for a more efficient approval process

4.3a(2) Institution's program performance data is integrated and analyzed to assess overall institution performance

+ Strengths

- Preparatory work done for the SACS self study and report is used to assess performance.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has an institutional effectiveness database that contributes to the process of setting goals and assessing departmental performance.
- Request for data reports and analysis by OIE has increased.
- OIE publishes newsletters on the analysis of departmental data.
- Program performance data is useful in SACS self-study.
- ACC conducts an employee satisfaction survey.
- ACC has a program review process in place, which includes the institutional effectiveness unit level database.
- ACC has in place internal collection of unit effectiveness data for the scheduling process.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Data analysis is frequently communicated at all levels informally (by word of mouth), often leaving interpretations of results up to the individuals involved.
- The OIE institutional effectiveness database appears to not be widely understood by faculty/staff.
- Faculty/staff members appear to be unaware of how a department's performance is related to overall College performance.
- There is a widespread perception that ACC has no structure or process for examining each college unit in terms of its function.
- There is a sense among employees that survey instruments are flawed and that data collected is not used consistently throughout the College.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Establish a comprehensive system of institutional program effectiveness that evaluates each program in terms of its function and relationship to the institution as a whole
- Establish a more explicit system for assessment of faculty/staff performance relative to function
- Conduct focus groups in order to promote a better understanding of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness role in generating performance data
- Assess the Office of Institutional Effectiveness role in managing the dissemination of data and establish policies/procedures as needed

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Lobby the THECB for consolidation of comparative data

4.3a(3) Institution integrates and analyzes its student and program performance data to assess performance relative to comparable institutions

+ Strengths

- Outside consultants are hired to analyze performance and recommend changes in key areas of the College.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness surveys and reports results on a request basis.
- The "Employee Satisfaction Survey" has been reinstated.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Decisions made by senior leadership are frequently communicated to faculty/staff without justification or underlying data.
- There is a widespread perception that ACC's political environment governs the analysis and interpretation of the data as well as the allocation of resources.
- The College does not use data that is available to compare ACC's performance to that of other institutions.
- The results of comparative analysis appear to be narrowly used (specific problems or situations, etc.).

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Consultant reports to be shared campus-wide
- Define and communicate reasons for analysis/decision making
- Ensure routine integration and analysis of student and program performance data to assess comparative performance.

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Identify a minimum of five ACC programs that can be compared to "Best Practices" programs at comparable institutions. Use findings for campus-wide program improvement

4.3a(4) Institution's operational performance data are integrated and analyzed to assess overall institution performance

+ Strengths

- Operational data was analyzed to establish the Eastview campus.
- ACC's Master Plan is integrated into the facilities and academic Master Plans.
- Operational complaints are handled through a systematic process.
- ACC collects useful data from the telephone registration system.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The HBC's relationship to campuses is not openly defined and communicated.
- Room utilization is inconsistent among campuses.
- The process for establishing staffing needs is not well defined.
- ACC units are fragmented in the collection and use of data.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Establish a clear feedback mechanism for operational preventatives
- Define operations by area and establish/clarify standards of operation
- Automate room utilization and other facilities reporting

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Form a committee to conduct an annual review of the integration of ACC's key operational performance data

4.3a(5) Institution integrates and analyzes its operational performance data relative to comparable institutions

+ Strengths

- Staffing table reports to the Board of Trustees (e.g., to justify changes and raises) frequently use comparative operational data.
- Square footage reports are utilized to position the College among peers and justify modifications to facilities and IT needs.
- The information technology unit reports that ACC's implementation of Datatel is more advanced than other Datatel users.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The integration of the budgeting process for the support of institutional performance is not evident or clearly defined.
- Faculty/staff appear unaware of how or whether comparative operational performance data are used for institutional improvement.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Senior leadership should place more emphasis on explaining how ACC integrates and analyzes its comparative operational performance data for institutional improvement
- Senior leadership to communicate budgetary decisions that are related to operational performance to faculty/staff

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Benchmark selected "Best Practices" program of comparable institutions and compare their key operational performance results against ACC

4.3b(1) Senior leaders to assess progress toward strategic goals and plans review institution's performance and capabilities

+ Strengths

- Senior leaders and organizations regularly present reviews of performance and capabilities to the Board of Trustees.
- Course level data is sent to senior leaders.
- The Citizens Advisory Committee report on the needs of the College was presented to the President and the Board.
- ACC's President makes decisions based on data.
- ACC is focused on institutional effectiveness results.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Upper level data-driven decisions are presented to faculty/staff informally.
- Input from faculty/staff is not evident in the assessment of progress.
- Employees are unaware how senior leaders use performance data for planning purposes.
- There is a perception that if data is used for decision-making/planning, it is happening primarily, if not exclusively, at the highest levels of the organization.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- The decision-making process and the assessment of progress toward strategic goals should be deployed campus-wide to faculty/staff

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior leadership should review various methods used to deploy the institution performance and capabilities accomplishments and progress against ACC's strategic plans and goals. Findings to be used to improve senior leaderships' communication of strategic accomplishments among faculty and staff

4.3b(2) Institutional review findings are translated and deployed into priorities for improvement, decisions on resource allocation and opportunities for innovation

+ Strengths

- The allocation of resources to Open Campus priorities is based on technology needs and innovation in that area.
- Committees base course schedule improvements on input and findings.
- The decision to implement the Datatel system was based on the need to centralize resources and integrate systems.
- The SACS self-study provided a major source of findings and has influenced actions.
- Faculty/staff take findings seriously and try to implement improvements based on the data.
- The Master Plan reflects a connection between budget planning and strategic plans.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The reasons for and expected outcomes of college reorganization are not explicitly communicated.
- The role of individual reviews is not apparent.
- Faculty and staff are generally unaware of how the findings of various reviews are integrated or used to improve the college, decide budgets or encourage innovation.
- There is a perception that many decisions are not data-driven or have little relation to findings or assessment, and that political/external factors are as important as data in decision-making.
- "Bottom-up" assessments are being conducted in some areas. It appears that employees generally feel that assessment of progress and decisions on improvement are "top-down" processes.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Complete "bottom-up" reviews and provides feedback to unit leaders
- Make explicit the underlying reasons and expected outcomes for reorganization

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Solicit innovative thinking from all levels of the college
- Involve people more widely in the process of using findings to make decisions and to determine the direction of college

Category 5
Faculty and Staff Focus

5 Faculty and Staff Focus

The ***Faculty and Staff Focus*** Category examines how the institution enables faculty and staff to develop and utilize their full potential, aligned with the institution's objectives. Also examined are the institution's efforts to build and maintain an environment and climate conducive to performance excellence, full participation, and personal and institutional growth.

5.1 Work Systems

5.1a(1) Institution designs, manages and improves work processes of faculty/staff, administrators, and supervisors that support the institution's strategic action plans and goals

+ Strengths

- Ad hoc cross-functional work teams are formed to review and improve key processes (e.g., Datatel super users group, registration post-mortem, etc.).
- For specific key areas, such as Datatel or budgets, training is offered on an ad-hoc basis.
- Staff professional development activities support ACC's strategic plans and goals, and the overall staff development plan appears to be positive.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Work processes are generally not documented.
- There appears to be a lack of awareness among all employee groups of the institution's strategic action plans and goals.
- Chronic staff shortages and turnover appear to have impacted negatively staff and supervisor communication and knowledge of work processes.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Form cross-functional teams to document key work processes
- Senior leadership should review communication gaps that exist in deploying ACC's strategic action plans and goals to all employee levels

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior administrators to review staff turnover rate problem and use findings to improve staff hiring process

5.1a(2) Institution's faculty, staff, administrators and supervisors communicate, cooperate, and share knowledge and skills across work functions, units and locations

+ Strengths

- Multi-disciplinary groups are often formed to address key issues (e.g., study skills modality for nursing students, crisis counseling committee, etc.).
- Various publications are routinely sent to all employees (e.g., Bulletin Board, President's newsletter, etc.) and the general feeling among faculty/staff is that the communications system has improved.
- ACCNet is used to communicate.
- Faculty/Staff task forces facilitate communications across ACC's various campus locations.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Communications with adjunct faculty appear to be generally ineffective.
- Staff groups generally believe communication throughout ACC is not effective.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Formally survey faculty/staff to measure to what extent communication, cooperation and sharing of knowledge and skills is deployed throughout ACC

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Conduct a formal communications audit of the ACC district and use findings to improve communication flow

5.1a(3) Institution's faculty, staff, administrators and supervisors ensure flexibility, rapid response and learning in addressing student, stakeholder and operational requirements

+ Strengths

- ACC faculty/staff appear flexible and student centered.
- Direct supervisors have an open door policy for staff reporting to them.
- Various standing committees (both administrative and faculty) meet regularly to address student, stakeholder and operational requirements.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- A long-term focus appears to be missing from the institution regarding ensuring flexibility, rapid response and learning in addressing student, stakeholders and operational requirements.
- Faculty access to senior administration to ensure rapid response and flexibility could be improved.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Aggregate all data received that addresses flexibility and rapid response to student and stakeholder requirements. Use data for process improvement

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Develop Service Quality Indicators (SQI's) to measure faculty/staff response time to student, stakeholder and operational requirements

5.1b Institution compensates and recognizes faculty and staff when they reinforce the institution's overall objectives

+ Strengths

- Formal employee recognition systems (such as ACColades) have been implemented.
- Faculty release time is available for program and curriculum improvement.
- Adjunct faculty is paid for completion of mandatory professional development.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- No faculty/staff rewards for recognition (financial or formal recognition) exist for reinforcing the institution's overall objectives.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Develop a formal faculty/staff reward and recognition system to reinforce ACC's overall strategic plans and objectives

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior leadership to host an annual dinner for faculty/staff that promote and reinforce the institution's overall objectives

5.2 Faculty and Staff Education, Training, and Development

5.2a(1) Institution's education and training support key strategic goals and action plans

+ Strengths

- A professional development plan has been developed and is currently in the implementation phase for staff.
- Tuition vouchers are available.
- Faculty/staff professional development requirements appear appropriate.
- A faculty development office has been created to help faculty meet ACC's strategic goal of effective teaching.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Employee groups appear to lack knowledge of strategic objectives and goals.
- Faculty/staff professional development activities appear to be underfunded.
- There is a perception that there is a lack of consistency regarding what constitutes "valid" professional development activities.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Conduct a campus-wide survey to gauge faculty/staff perception of what should be included in professional development initiatives

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Continue to align all faculty/staff training and professional development with strategic goals and plans

5.2a(2) Institution's faculty/staff education and training support the institution's work systems

+ Strengths

- Professional development workshops are directed toward work processes (in general, not necessarily at ACC specific processes) and workplace skills.
- A mentoring system exists to help people learn work processes.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Training is not evaluated for quality.
- Training for more complex processes, such as Datatel, do not have enough "hands on" time and lack depth.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Professional development workshops to support ACC's strategic goals and plans

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Review evaluation used to measure education and training effectiveness. Use findings for process improvement

5.2a(3) Institution delivers education and training to faculty and staff

+ Strengths

- A professional development program is on going and required for staff and adjunct faculty, with some choices.
- Training programs provide discipline-specific training for adjuncts.
- Conferences/seminars/training sessions are available for faculty/staff and administration.
- Tuition vouchers are in place.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The quality of orientations receive mixed reviews.
- New employees are not taken on a "tour" of the College.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Use focus groups to review new hire orientation and revise based on input
- Review faculty/staff education and training curriculum and use findings to improve training and development initiatives

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Conduct an annual training needs assessment survey for faculty/staff. Use findings for program improvements

5.2a(4) Institution reinforces knowledge and skills of faculty and staff on-the-job

+ Strengths

- Many areas have regular meetings and e-mail communications.
- Many programs have strong business and industry links.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Many areas have too many regular meetings and e-mail communications.
- Some professional development activities are not tied to actual jobs.
- Learning new skills does not necessarily mean more responsibility or upgrades in position.
- Some areas have no "career path."

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Ensure that all new knowledge received by faculty/staff has on-the-job application
- Professional development should be an integral component built into each faculty/staff performance evaluation

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Faculty/staff use of knowledge received in training and education workshops to be evaluated against their on-the-job application

5.2a(5) Institution's evaluation and improvement of its education and training

+ Strengths

- Most (but not all) individual training sessions are evaluated at the end of the session.
- Annual employee satisfaction surveys are administered.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Evaluations are for specific sessions only. Overall programs are not evaluated.
- A proliferation of education and training opportunities exists. However, they are often ad hoc and unrelated.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Institution to ensure that all training and education initiatives are evaluated by participants and results are aggregated and used for curriculum improvement

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Formally evaluate all key programs and use findings for program improvement

5.3 Faculty and Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction

5.3a Institution maintains a safe and healthful work environment that supports the well-being, satisfaction, and motivation of faculty/staff

+ Strengths

- Communication appears open at the "campus staff" level.
- An employee satisfaction survey is used (appears that limited actions are taken because of the survey results).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Custodial services appear poor at most ACC campuses.
- Air quality is cited as being poor at Highland Business Center.
- A perception exists among faculty/staff that the maintenance of a healthy work environment is not a priority issue for senior administration.
- Safety and health issues vary at each campus.
- A perception exists among faculty/staff that a lot of data is gathered, but nothing is ever done with it regarding maintaining a safe and healthy work environment throughout ACC.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Survey faculty/staff to determine what extent ACC's work environment supports a safe and healthful workplace

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Review safety and health training and education initiatives conducted throughout the institution. Use findings for process improvements

5.3b(1) Institution provides services, benefits and actions that support faculty/staff well- being, satisfaction and motivation

+ Strengths

- The employee benefits package appears to be in line with similar sized institutions.
- Employee Assistance Program, tuition vouchers, sabbatical opportunities, etc., are used to contribute to faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation.
- Gyms exist at the larger campuses.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The Wellness program was removed from employee services.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Form faculty/staff focus groups to discuss and identify special services and benefits that would aid employee well-being and satisfaction

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Promote faculty/staff special services and benefits on ACC's Web site

5.3b(2) Senior leaders, administrators, and supervisors encourage faculty/staff to develop and utilize their full potential

+ Strengths

- An employee recognition program is in place.
- Faculty retreats and employee recognition at General Assembly encourage faculty/staff to develop and utilize their full potential.
- Faculty/staff are encouraged by senior leaders, administrators and supervisors.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- No "career ladder" exists for most positions.
- Personnel are rarely moved within the college to better utilize their talents and interests.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Senior leadership should formally recognize employees who develop and utilize their full potential within ACC

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Senior leaders should encourage leadership development among faculty and staff

5.3c(1) Institution assesses faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction, and motivation

+ Strengths

- The employee satisfaction survey is used to assess faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation.
- Attrition rates and reasons for leaving are reviewed.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Little appears to be done with survey data collected.
- There is no systematic formal process to measure faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Develop a systematic process to assess faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Form a "Blue Ribbon" employee council to assess faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation

5.3c(2) Institution relates faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation results to key performance results

+ Strengths

- None identified

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Data is collected but not utilized.
- The Administration is viewed as impeding rather than aligning faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation results with key performance results.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Align faculty/staff well-being, satisfaction and motivation results with key performance results

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Annual faculty/staff satisfaction results to be used to identify improvement opportunities

Category 6
Educational and Support Process Management

6 Educational and Support Process Management

The ***Educational and Support Process Management*** Category examines the key aspects of process management, including learning-focused education design, education delivery, institution services, and operations. The Category examines how key processes are designed, implemented, managed and improved to achieve better performance.

6.1 Education Design and Delivery

6.1a(1) Institution ensures that educational programs and offerings are designed and implemented to address student educational needs and focus on active learning

+ Strengths

- ACC reviews curriculum (via curriculum committee and task forces/programs) and transfer information.
- A technology plan is being developed from the collegewide technology committee in the areas of LRS and discipline-specific planning.
- All disciplines must have syllabi per SACS requirement.
- Inputs are received from advisory committees (content) and student evaluations (delivery).
- Inputs are received from industry and community.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Foreign languages do identify course goals and objectives, however no mechanism is in place to follow up if weaknesses are identified.
- A systematic method for focusing on active learning does not exist.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to develop a collegewide communication plan that promotes educational programs and offerings

Long Term (2 years or more)

- ACC to ensure that curriculum throughout the institution focuses on student and program needs and active learning

6.1a(2) Institution ensures that educational programs and offerings address sequencing and offer linkages

+ Strengths

- Task Forces/programs provide sequencing of courses and work to ensure transferability of courses.
- ACC uses the Texas common course numbering system and is implementing the state required core curriculum.
- Interdisciplinary linkages on the international curriculum level are beginning to be made.
- ACC is establishing prerequisite requirements for students.
- Articulation agreements exist with many four-year colleges.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- A systematic approach to interdisciplinary linkages does not exist.
- ACC is establishing prerequisite requirements for students.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to review educational programs for their interdisciplinary linkages

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Educational programs to be sequenced and linked in single disciplines and related disciplines institution-wide

6.1a(3) Institution ensures that educational programs and offerings include a measurement plan that makes effective use of formative and summative assessment

+ Strengths

- ACC has an Office of Institutional Effectiveness that provides information to departments.
- ACC has a program review process that uses focus groups and student surveys to gain formative information.
- The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board audits programs on a four-year cycle and requires responses to identified weaknesses (external).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There is no follow-up on formative or summative evaluations after new programs are implemented.
- New programs are not formally tested before being implemented.
- A formal way of communicating formative and summative results to the institution does not exist.
- Some support services use benchmarks, however these benchmarks are not used for program review (i.e. information is gathered, but not used).

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to incorporate a rigorous and systematic process for sampling output of new programs before implementing campus-wide

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Develop a follow-up system for formative and summative evaluations after new programs are implemented

6.1a(4) Institution ensures that faculty is properly prepared for all educational programs and offerings

+ Strengths

- ACC has hiring criteria (including credentials) in place for full-time and adjunct faculty.
- The faculty development office is implementing a systematic faculty development plan for all faculty.
- ACC has created incentives to link professional development to the salary scale for adjunct faculty.
- Many workforce faculty are current in their teaching areas because they are employed in a related industry.
- ACC has a mentoring program for faculty.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Faculty availability is not considered for program development or expansion.
- Faculty development initiatives at discipline level are not systematically shared with other disciplines.
- A properly prepared faculty is based on the efforts of individual instructors, but a systematic approach across disciplines does not exist.
- Adjunct faulty may have content knowledge (expertise) but not instructional skills. A systematic approach to ensure they obtain instructional skills does not exist.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Develop a workshop for instructional skills to aid adjunct faculty and regular faculty who have more subject matter knowledge than they have instructional skills

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Review ACC's faculty development initiatives and use findings to develop a systematic approach

6.1b(1) Institution ensures that on-going educational programs and offerings meet design requirements

+ Strengths

- All workforce programs have advisory committees.
- Workforce program changes are based on industry requirements.
- ACC tracks the success of transfer students.
- ACC tracks retention rates.
- There is a system in place to review and phase out obsolete courses.
- ACC benchmarks against other colleges to see what courses are offered/needed.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- None identified

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Form a cross-functional faculty team to review program designs to ensure that design requirements are being met

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Conduct assessments each semester to ensure that key education programs and offerings meet design requirements

6.1b(2) Institution ensures that observations, measures, and/or indicators are used to provide timely information to help students/faculty

+ Strengths

- A mentoring system exists for new faculty.
- There is a formal faculty evaluation process.
- The recent Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) site review resulted in budget modification for the Radio-Television-Film program.
- The Student Government Association provides information to the Board.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The process in place to identify at-risk students is not consistent in terms of intervention follow up.
- Individual staff can easily disrupt the flow of information.
- Information is not distributed in a timely manner.
- Appropriate communication about the purposes of data, source of data and how to use it with faculty and staff does not exist.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Review key educational programs and offerings each semester to gauge whether or not the programs or offerings require corrective action

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Program to be reviewed for redesign when student scores and program ratings drop below established minimum standards

6.1b(3) Institution evaluates and improves educational programs and offerings

+ Strengths

- A formal program review process was implemented during the 1999/2000 academic year.
- The content of workforce programs are evaluated through the advisory committee process.
- ACC responds to recommendations from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board program reviews.
- The delivery of all programs are evaluated through the student evaluation process.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- None identified

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Assess the formal program review process after the 1999/2000 academic year to ensure the effectiveness of the review

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Continue to monitor the program review process on an annual basis

6.2 Educational Support Processes

6.2a(1) Institution considers the needs of students, faculty, and other stakeholders when determining key education support processes

+ Strengths

- The Citizens Advisory Committee identified needs of students.
- Students and faculty provide input into support services.
- Teachers are assigned to committees that relate to the key education support processes.
- The Student Government Association (SGA) provides monthly information to the Board and the President.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- A systematic institutional way of considering needs of students in determining key educational support services does not exist.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Develop survey or host focus groups to help ACC determine future key support services that need to be in place

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Continue to survey students, faculty and staff on an annual basis regarding education support services

6.2a(2) Institution meets students, faculty, staff, and operational requirements when designing and implementing key support processes

+ Strengths

- General operating needs are met through the budgetary process.
- ACC has moved toward providing uniform support across campuses.
- Four percent of ACC's budget is directed towards technology/equipment support.
- All full-time faculty have computers.
- ACC holds mock registration to identify and resolve potential problems.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- The size of learning labs is not adequate to meet students' needs.
- ACC provides a minimal level of budgetary support for some key support processes.
- Advice given to students from counselors and advisors is not always accurate and /or adequate (e.g. course equivalency from other institutions).
- The level of communication is not adequate.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to review budgetary provision for key support processes

Long Term (2 years or more)

- ACC to survey students regarding counseling and advice received from faculty and staff at the end of each academic year. Findings to be used for training faculty/staff on giving more reliable information to students

6.2a(3) Institution's key education support processes and their principal requirements and measures are identified

+ Strengths

- The key education support processes at ACC include LRS services, instructional technology, open access computer centers, student workshop and training, student assessment office, testing centers, student advising, counseling and financial aid.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Not all implemented key support processes are measured.
- Information from student surveys and focus groups is not at an adequate level.
- Not all employees are aware that measurements take place.
- Technology is available to gather statistical information on student usage, but is not implemented in all areas.
- Information is not widely shared across ACC.
- A systematic approach to disseminate summative information does not exist.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- ACC to ensure that principle requirements and measures of key support processes are clearly documented

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Key support processes and their principle requirements to be reviewed at the end of each academic year to ensure that they meet student, faculty and staff requirements and expectations

6.2a(4) Institution's key support processes are managed and maintained to ensure meeting student, faculty/staff and operational requirements

+ Strengths

- The faculty advises students in technical areas in the absence of a formal system.
- Campus managers support the organizational structure.
- The organizational structure allows for processes to be managed.
- The budget process provides stability to support requirements.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC employs a help desk approach as opposed to a formalized process.
- The deployment of key support processes are not consistently measured and managed.
- Resources for student services are not adequate (e.g. manpower, space, computers, training).
- There are complaints about business services (e.g. problem with student refunds, receiving paychecks and petty cash reimbursements).

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Consider providing comment cards for support services to gauge the extent these services are meeting or exceeding student, facility and staff requirements

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Develop on-line survey system to allow student, faculty and staff to comment on support services processes

6.2a(5) Institution evaluates and improves key support processes to achieve better performance

+ Strengths

- ACC benchmarks against other state institution's key support processes.
- ACC used the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to evaluate several areas including student services, financial aid, student space on campus, and LRS.
- The Student Services department uses surveys and student/faculty focus groups to evaluate registration processes, scheduling and improvements for catalog and course schedules.
- ACC is attempting to establish more uniform processes across campuses.
- Some user groups review and evaluate their processes (e.g., continuing education and state reporting).
- ACC has an employee performance evaluation system in place.
- There is a collegewide evaluation of functions (i.e. employee survey).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- ACC has made sporadic efforts in regards to evaluating key support processes.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Consistently evaluate key support processes and use result findings for on-going process improvement

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Continue to evaluate key support services on an annual basis to achieve performance excellence campus-wide

Category 7
Institutional Performance Results

7 Institutional Performance Results

The ***Institution Performance Results*** Category examines student performance, student and stakeholder satisfaction, faculty and staff results, and institution-specific performance. Also examined are performance levels relative to comparable institutions and/or appropriately selected institutions.

7.1 Student Performance Results

7.1a Institution summarizes current levels and trends of student performance results

+ Strengths

- The institution publishes an annual Fact Book. Task forces/programs utilize the data presented in the Fact Book to determine course scheduling. The Fact Book represents key trends relating to student performance, job acquisition and graduation against key institution objectives.

- Key data are provided and documented by Office of Institutional Effectiveness for most indicators related to efficient and effective processes of student performance results.

- The Workforce Education Department determines program performance by reviewing the number of licenses issued to students and student employment rates.

- ACC identifies educationally at risk students and requires them to do educational planning and the students are then monitored to track performance accomplishments for 1-2 semesters.

- Developmental curriculum instructional areas collect's data on their students and utilizes that data for future planning of courses and curriculum.

- ACC has established systems to follow student accomplishments:

  –TASP monitored students

  –Hearing impaired program tracks students

  –Students' progress tracked by grades

  –Students receiving financial aid are continuously monitored

  –Financial aid tracks students pass and drop rates

  –ACC gets completion rates and tracks its students when they transfer to other universities

- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has obtained data on graduation rates, transfer rates and changes in programs through annual surveys.

- ACC conducts several comparisons with other state institutions in relation to student performance and key college objectives.

- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness reports are used as reference when faculty/staff look for aggregate information on student performance.

- Various departments of the College determine student performance accomplishments annually by conducting surveys.

- Counselors and advisors keep data records related to student performance results. Advisors and counselors are distributed equitably across the campuses; thus more on-site advising and counseling does occur.

- The Student Services department survey students to try to identify students at risk of failing or withdrawing.

- Institutional effectiveness indicators created the President's Effectiveness Council process.

- A process is in place for each area of the College to develop institutional effectiveness measures which are reviewed and when applicable analyzed annually by OIE.

- ACC implemented a systematic approach to institutional effectiveness. Institutional effectiveness staff is integrated into various parts of the operation. Effectiveness indicators are being measured annually and presented in Board reports.

- Opportunities for Improvement

None identified

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- OIE designated as the hub for all student performance information data results to be deployed to all employees at the campus level

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Data deployment to be reviewed by various user groups to determine if appropriate data is being deployed at the campus level throughout ACC

- ACC's departments to collaborate with OIE on student performance data requirements

- Library of collegewide student performance data information be made accessible through OIE web pages

7.2 Student and Stakeholder Satisfaction Results

7.2a Institution summarizes levels and trends of satisfaction and dissatisfaction results for current and past students and stakeholders

+ Strengths

- Various surveys are conducted to obtain key indicators regarding the current and past students and stakeholder satisfaction with the College. The performance indicators are compared against key College objectives.
- A survey of internal services was mailed to all employees by OIE.
- Time is allotted at ACC Board meetings for input from various college internal and external stakeholders.
- The Citizen's Advisory Committee was formed to advise the College on strategies.
- The President's newsletter summarizes performance results by organizational activities.
- The College conducts a number of annual surveys which information reflects favorable trends of satisfaction by various internal and external stakeholders.
- The institution has students complete a facilities survey.
- There is a new survey from the OIE office that has to do with institutional effectiveness.
- The hearing impaired program conducts a survey of services delivered to students.
- The institution conducts faculty evaluations and employee satisfaction surveys.
- Periodic assessments of services in IT and Visual Communication Design are conducted.
- Stakeholders consisting of 100 major civic leaders are surveyed each year through the President's evaluation process on performance expectation results.
- The Board has had stakeholders' meetings with the results documented in the Board report.

- The President is involved in many committees and gets verbal feedback directly from community stakeholders.

- Faculty evaluations are systematic – this provides students a good feedback mechanism.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There appears to be program summaries in different areas, but there do not appear to be any clear-cut trends of satisfied/dissatisfied student and stakeholder results. There are various areas of "pockets" of information of individual activities, but they lack any formal or overall levels or trends. The college does not consistently analyze data that are available-reasons for student withdrawal, employee satisfaction surveys, etc. Much of the results on community/business stakeholders are anecdotal.

- Many ad hoc groups lack qualification and trending results.

- Lack of awareness stands out about information in ACC and satisfaction gleaned from outside surveys.

- Participants identified occasional questionnaires that go to students but nothing was identified that are on a regular basis.

- Participants identified a stakeholder agency that refers students to ACC but is not surveyed regarding the satisfaction of service that ACC provides (CTRC).

- There is no one place to go for comprehensive information about ACC.

- No formal survey of external groups (universities, the community) is in place.

- No systematic communications about satisfaction/dissatisfaction trend analysis results in place.

- Much data on satisfaction appears to be anecdotal.

- Many areas of the college collect satisfaction data informally, but not systematically. The results of such surveys may not always be provided to the general college community, nor does the data seem to be studied for any trends that might be developing. There seems to be a need for systematic/on-going data gathering throughout the College.

- There is no one central location to retrieve all information regarding ACC. Information is maintained on the Web.

- Summaries of satisfaction/dissatisfaction levels for information are not consistently identified.

- The College lacks the use of a national instrument to get comparative data on performance results.

- Satisfaction results are not published or done systematically. There is a need to systematize results in non-instructional areas.

- The College does not have trend levels of faculty evaluations in terms of improvement over time in various instructional areas.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Develop a systematic means of measuring and trending student/stakeholder satisfaction results

Long Term (2 years or more)

- ACC to review, aggregate and trend key student/stakeholder satisfaction/dissatisfaction data for current and past students and stakeholders

7.3 Faculty and Staff Results

7.3a Institution summarizes current levels and trends of faculty and staff well-being, satisfaction, and development.

Strengths

- Professional Development Program data is collected.
- The Human Resources Department conducts exit interviews of employees and collect results.
- The adjunct faculty has been surveyed and results are available on satisfaction and professional development.
- Salary and benefits of faculty have been analyzed, including benchmark comparisons with other institutions.
- The employee satisfaction survey is administered and data is collected.
- There are new activities (ACColades, vouchers, staff development workshops) designed to promote employee well being and development and results are collected.
- The salary survey conducted by Human Resources benchmarks ACC against the community and other peer institutions.
- The Information Technology market valuation survey and analysis results lead to increased levels of satisfaction.
- The institution has addressed the issue of compensation by implementing reclassification studies, and benchmarking its salary compensation packages against those of other institutions.
- A more formalized system of faculty/staff development has recently been implemented; the voucher system that enables employees to take classes is an example of such a system; tying raises to faculty/staff development (faculty/staff development is now mandatory) is another example of offering more faculty/staff development opportunities.
- The salary survey helped to raise some salaries to market rate.
- The President's evaluation includes a survey of employee organizations to determine their views and results.

- Diversity and turnover data is kept and used as a guide for compensation; it shows progress, especially with full-time faculty.

- The College collects turnover data and uses that to adjust compensation (i.e. professional technical and classified salaries are higher in some areas as a result of feedback data).

- Opportunities for Improvement

- There is a need for increased communication of data results to the college community. There is a belief that data are not routinely collected. There is no evidence of trend data for faculty and staff well being. There is a belief that the results collected may not be used or disseminated. There have been little data collected on results of new college initiatives. The Office of Professional Development has started documenting feedback information on the programs offered. The information recorded to date is too new, since the program is less than six months old. Data are currently being collected, but these are new and so trend data are not systematic. The data are still "emerging."

- Employees are not aware of data on satisfaction and turnover rates. No data were cited regarding employee turnover rates. Employee turnover rates in various areas of the College were identified as a concern, primarily in the computer support areas. There is a need to analyze turnover rates in all areas to determine what other problems may exist.

- Salaries may not be at the level of the college community which impacts faculty and staff morale. There is a need for ACC to benchmark salaries with other employees in Austin rather than colleges in a different economic environment. The institution may need to develop comparative studies not only with other like institutions, but also within the private sector of its own service areas. There may be a need to increase the salary levels to keep up with current market demand.

- Mid-management has requested a "bottom-up" evaluation in addition to the current "top-down" evaluation of employees.

- The institution does not review all faculty/staff development activities annually.

- Upward evaluation results and trends are not being captured regarding well-being, satisfaction and development.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Collect and trend employee turnover rates for all key areas of the College

Long Term (2 years or more)

- Satisfaction results to be trended and made available to all employee levels

7.4 Institution-Specific Results

7.4a Institution summarizes key performance results that contribute to enhancing learning and/or operational effectiveness

+ Strengths

- Monthly Board reports (information and data) are available on ACC's Web site.
- The process of program review and evaluation through capstone reports is in place.
- The budget process reviews performance results, therefore contributing to the decision-making process regarding, number of courses, number of adjuncts, etc.
- The Fact Book summarizes key student, demographic, faculty/staff and faculty results.
- State reports summarize key performance results.
- The President's Web site was reorganized as a focal point for reporting goals and direction of the College. Reports are available on the web.
- The Board gets data reports on fiscal effectiveness.
- Campus police report data on safety.
- High demand data is used to improve course scheduling.
- Quarterly and other financial report data are published.
- Office of Institutional Effectiveness reports data regarding classes needed versus classes full, which has enabled the College to increase section offerings in some areas.
- Employee satisfaction survey data provide feedback to the College.
- Performance indicators (learning) lead to organization of institutional effectiveness measures reported to the Board.
- Functional sector data analysis is being done.
- Process reviews data in target areas
  - -personal
  - -payroll
  - -audit health benefits

- There is an established system of measuring institutional effectiveness. The system is tied to discipline specific effectiveness measures.

- There are regular reports to board on institutional effectiveness data.

- Level of subsidy of programs data exist (do they generate revenue, and do they need support).

- Benchmark data (state formula) for resources within departments is used for staffing decisions.

- Opportunities for Improvement

- Human resource costs results data does not appear to be reviewed extensively.

- A comprehensive system is not in place that gathers or deploys information and results data at the campus level.

- Data in different areas are collected, but participants expressed concern that the College does not use comparative data as a gauge against other colleges or industry standards.

- Participants expressed frustration with their inability to acquire data regarding the delay of services in some areas due to budgeting constraints.

- Data reports/information are not used to drive decision making in all areas.

- Campus police reports are difficult to find.

- Little data/analysis is done on costs, and efficiency of support areas within the College.

- The use of financial data for comparisons is lacking.

- Tracking of overall operational effectiveness needs improvement.

- Satisfaction of services performed and summary of services provided by area are not tracked.

- Summary results data regarding employee satisfaction surveys is unavailable.

Strategic Planning Issues:

Short Term (1 to 2 years)

- Survey data to be available to all employee levels

Long Term (2 years or more)

- ACC to consider tracking performance and capturing results in cost containment of key programs that enhance learning and/or operational effectiveness

AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BALDRIGE INSTITUTIONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT
ASSESSMENT TEAMS

TEAM I: LEADERSHIP

RAMIREZ (Chair)	**ANTONIO**	Professor, Associate	Engineer Design Graphics	NRG	Full-time Faculty
BREY (Co-chair)	**RONALD**	VP, Associate Open Campus	Open Campus	PIN	Administrators
GOODALL	**DONETTA**	VP, Associate Academic Affairs	Assoc Vp Acad Programs	HBC	Administrators
SCHULMAN	**GEOFFREY**	Professor, Associate	Commercial Music	NRG	Full-time Faculty
POOL	**JACKIE**	Administrative Assistant, Sr	Provost	CYP	Classified
BRADSHAW	**ELIZABETH**	Foundation Representative			

TEAM II: STRATEGIC PLANNING

PEEBLES (Chair)	**REX**	Professor	Government	NRG	Dean
KINSLOW (Co-chair)	**STEPHEN**	Exec VP, Campus Oper, Student	CAM OPER, STU AFF, & SCH REL	HBC	Administrators
WAGNER	**MARY**	Professor, Associate	Diagnostic Med Img Rad	RVS	Full-time Faculty
PARDUE	**SUE**	Dean, Workforce Continuing Education	Career & Business Development	HBC	Administrators
SMITH	**RICHARD**	Director, LRS Operations	Learning Resource Services Admin	RGC	Administrators

TEAM III: STUDENT & STAKEHOLDER FOCUS

TUCKER (Chair)	**GERALDINE**	VP, Associate Human Resources	Human Resources	HBC	Administrators
SANDERS (Co-chair)	**CECILE**	Professor	Medical Lab Technology	RVS	Dean
SPEAR	**GALE**	Professor	Child Care & Dev	EVC	Full-time Faculty
COCCIA	**ELIZABETH**	Campus Dean Student Services	Student Development	PIN	Administrators
WALKER	**DENISE**	Student			

TEAM IV: INFORMATION & ANALYSIS

DAUDE (Chair)	**MATTHEW**	Professor, Associate	Philosophy	RGC	Full-time Faculty
ALLIE (Co-chair)	**ELVA**	VP, Exec Instruction & Student Affairs	V.P. Executive	HBC	Administrators
HAMPTON	**GARY**	Professor	Health & Kinesiology	RVS	Dean
LOSTRACCO	**JOE**	Professor	English	RGC	Full-time Faculty
CARTER	**WILLIAM**	VP, Associate Information Technology	Information Technology	HBC	Administrators
MILLER	**JERRY**	VP, Business Services	Business Services	HBC	Administrators

TEAM V: FACULTY & STAFF FOCUS

MIDGLEY (Chair)	**MICHAEL**	Professor, Associate	Accounting	NRG	Dean
CULP (Co-chair)	**MAGGIE**	VP, Associate Student Service	Assoc Vp Student Services	HBC	Administrators
KOOKER	**STEPHEN**	Professor	Electronics	NRG	Full-time Faculty
STEWART	**TERRY**	Director, Teaching Excellence	Faculty Development	HBC	Professional
MORRISON	**LINDA**	Manager, Business Development	Career & Business Development	HBC	Professional

AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BALDRIGE INSTITUTIONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT
ASSESSMENT TEAMS

TEAM VI: EDUCATION & SUPPORT PROCESS MANAGEMENT

MCGUFFEE (Chair)	**JAMES**	Professor, Associate	Computer Information Systems	RVS	Full-time Faculty
AMMONS (Co-chair)	**SHEILA**	Professor	Accounting	NRG	Full-time Faculty
OSBORN	**EDWARD**	Executive, Market & Public Inf	Marketing & Publication	HBC	Administrators
DUNCAN-HALL	**TYRA**	Provost, Central Austin Campus	Provost	EVC	Administrators
YOUNG	**LINDA**	Director, Grants Program	Grant Development	HBC	Administrators
KOERNER	**SONIA**	Coordinator, Tasp	Admissions & Records	HBC	Professional

TEAM VII: INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE RESULTS

OBURN (Chair)	**MARTHA**	VP, Associate Institutional Effectiveness	Assoc Vp Inst Effectiveness	HBC	Administrators
MCMANIGLE (Co-chair)	**MILTON**	Grant Writer	Grant Development	HBC	Professional
FONTE	**RICHARD**	President, Executive Officer	Chief Executive Office	HBC	Executive
WARD	**HAZEL**	Professor	English	RVS	Dean
SUTTON	**GLORIA**	Professor	Student Development	RVS	Counselors
SLIVINSKE	**ALEC**	Professor	Economics	NRG	Full-time Faculty